

03-02-00

A

+

02/29/00

Jc713 U.S. PTO

Please type a plus sign (+) inside this box →

PTO/SB/05

UTILITY PATENT APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL (Only for new nonprovisional applications under 37 CFR 1.53(b))	Attorney Docket No.	C99021US
	First Named Inventor or Application identifier	MARY ELLEN ZURKO
ADDRESS TO: Assistant Commissioner of Patents Box Patent Application Washington, DC 20231	Title	VERIFICATION OF TRUSTED-PATH COMMANDS
	Express Mail No.	EL357886594US

APPLICATION ELEMENTS

See MPEP chapter 600 concerning utility patent application contents

1. ☒ Fee Transmittal Form PTO/SB/17 (submit in duplicate)
2. ☒ Specification [Total Pages: 67]
3. ☒ Drawing(s) (35 USC 113) [Total Sheets: 7]
4. ☒ Oath or Declaration [Total Pages: 2]
 - a. ☐ Newly executed (original or copy)
 - b. ☒ Copy from a prior application (37 CFR 1.63(d))
(for continuation/divisional with No. 17 completed)

[Note No. 5 below]

 - i. ☐ DELETION OF INVENTOR(S)
Signed statement attached deleting
inventor(s) named in the prior application, see
37 CFR 1.63(d)(2) and 1.33(b).
5. ☒ Incorporation By Reference (useable if No. 4b is
checked)
The entire disclosure of the prior application, from which a copy of
the oath or declaration is supplied under No. 4b, is considered as
being part of the disclosure of the accompanying application and is
hereby incorporated by reference therein.
6. ☐ Microfiche Computer Program (Appendix)
7. ☐ Nucleotide and/or Amino Acid Sequence Submission
(if applicable, all necessary)
 - a. ☐ Computer Readable Copy
 - b. ☐ Paper Copy (identical to computer copy)
 - c. ☐ Statement verifying identity of above
copies

ACCOMPANYING APPLICATION PARTS

8. ☐ Assignment Papers (cover sheet & document(s))
9. ☐ Power of Attorney
10. ☐ English Translation Document (if applicable)
11. ☐ Information Disclosure
Statement (IDS)/PTO-1449
____ Copies of IDS Citations
12. ☐ Preliminary Amendment
13. ☒ Return Receipt Postcard (Itemized)
14. ☐ Small Entity Statement(s)
Statement filed in prior application. Status still
proper and desired
15. ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
(if foreign priority is claimed)
16. ☐ Other: _____

Jc715 U.S. PTO

09/515384

02/29/00

17. If a CONTINUING APPLICATION, check appropriate blank and supply the requisite information:

☐ Continuation |
☒ Divisional | of prior application No.: 07/479,666
☐ Continuation-in-part (CIP) |

18. Correspondence Address					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Customer Number or Bar Code Label		or		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Correspondence address below	
		001200			
(Insert Customer No. or Attach bar code label here)					
Name	AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P.				
Address	711 Louisiana, Suite 1900				
City	Houston	State	Texas	Zip Code	77002
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	(713) 220-5800	Fax	(713) 236-0822

David R. Clonts, Reg. No. 36,768

Date: 2/29/00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicants:	§	
	§	
MARY ELLEN ZURKO	§	
THOMAS A. CASEY, JR.	§	
MORRIE GASSER	§	
JUDITH S. HALL	§	
CLIFFORD E. KAHN	§	
ANDREW H. MASON	§	
PAUL DOUGLAS SAWYER	§	
LESLIE RICHARD KENDALL	§	
STEVEN B. LIPNER	§	
	§	
Filed: Concurrently Herewith	§	Art Unit:
	§	
Serial No.: Unknown	§	Examiner:
	§	
For: VERIFICATION OF TRUSTED- PATH COMMANDS	§	Docket No.: C99021US
	§	

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

BOX PATENT APPLICATION
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

Please amend the divisional application as follows before consideration of this case:

In the Title:

Please replace the current title with the new title "VERIFICATION OF TRUSTED-PATH COMMANDS".

In the Claims:

Please cancel claims 1-20.

Please add new claims 21-28:

- 1 21. (New) A machine-executed method for verifying the existence of a trusted
2 path to a user in a computing system, the computer system including a trusted computing
3 environment, the method comprising the steps of:

4 (a) upon login by a user, assigning a process identifier to the user in the
5 trusted computing environment;
6 (b) storing the assigned process identifier in trusted memory;
7 (c) establishing a trusted path between the user and the trusted computing
8 environment;
9 (d) through the trusted path, displaying the process identifier to the user;
10 and
11 (e) upon the user's subsequent entry into the trusted environment,
12 displaying the process identifier to the user through the trusted path.

1 22. (New) The method of claim 21, wherein the process identifier is a randomly
2 or pseudo-randomly generated group of alphanumeric characters.

1 23. (New) The method of claim 21, wherein the process identifier is
2 pronounceable.

1 24. (New) An automatic data processing machine programmed to execute the
2 method of any one of claims 21 to 23.

1 25. (New) An automatic data processing machine comprising means for
2 performing the method steps of any one of claims 21 to 23.

1 26. (New) A program storage device readable by a machine and tangibly
2 embodying a representation of a program of instructions adaptable to be executed by said
3 machine to perform the method of any one of claims 21 to 23.

1 27. (New) Apparatus for executing a trusted command that is issued by a user and
2 that is parsed by untrusted parsing means to generate a parsed command, comprising:

3 (a) trusted means for receiving the parsed command via a trusted path;
4 (b) means for displaying a representation of the parsed command to the
5 user for verification; and
6 (c) trusted means for executing the verified parsed command.

1 28. (New) A program storage device readable by a machine and encoding
2 machine-executable instructions that include instructions for performing the methods of any
3 one of claims 21 through 23.


REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment presents new claims 21-28 which are directed to verification of trusted-path commands. Claims 21-28 essentially correspond to non-elected claims 10-16 and 21 from the parent case. Unlike the non-elected claims 13-15 and 21 in the parent case, new claims 24-28 depend only from the claims in this case.

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such actions are respectfully requested. If there are any questions or comments regarding this Preliminary Amendment, the Examiner is encouraged to contact George W. Jordan III or David R. Clonts at (713) 220-5800.

Respectfully submitted,

2/29/99
Date


David R. Clonts, Reg. No. 36,768

AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P.
711 Louisiana, Suite 1900
Houston, TX 77002
(713) 220-5800
(713) 236-0822 Fax

PD90-0141
DIGU:012/TOE

METHOD FOR EXECUTING TRUSTED-PATH COMMANDS

BY

Mary Ellen Zurko
Thomas A. Casey, Jr.
Morrie Gasser
Judith S. Hall
Clifford E. Kahn
Andrew H. Mason
Paul Douglas Sawyer
Leslie Richard Kendall
Steven B. Lipner

"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL

NUMBER NB 182,620,812

DATE OF DEPOSIT 2/13/90

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE IS A TRUE AND CORRECT
COPY OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT AS SUBMITTED TO THE
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE FOR DEPOSIT
SERVICE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.51 ON THE DATE INDICATED TO
ABOVE, AND IS APPROPRIATE TO THE DEPOSIT OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20531

Donna Rautice

SIG

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Security Criteria; Reference Validation Systems	2
1.4 Assurance Objectives and "Trusted" Systems	5
1.5 Parsers as Increasers of System Complexity	8
2. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION	10
3. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS	16
4. DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC EMBODIMENTS	17
4.1 Overview of Software Architecture	17
4.2 User Terminals and the Secure-Attention Key	21
4.3 The Trusted Path and Direct Commands	23
4.4 Login Processing by the TCB	26
4.5 Connection to Untrusted Process	27
4.6 The Process Identifier	28
4.7 The Command Conveyor	32
4.8 Distribution of Processing of Trusted Commands	33
4.9 Display of Command to User	39
4.10 The SSVR as an Audit Recorder	50
4.11 Confirmation by Others than the Submitting User ...	51
CLAIMS	54
ABSTRACT	65

1. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

1.1 Introduction

This invention relates to a method for improving security in a computer system. More specifically, this invention concerns a method for implementing trusted commands through both trusted and untrusted code.

1.2 Background

The proliferation of computers has resulted in the need for reliable computer security systems. The need to protect certain information is great in areas dealing with national security, for example. Security measures are required in other fields, including areas which utilize financial, medical, and personal information. Many computerized information systems therefore include internal security measures which provide the users with different levels of access to the computerized information, and which attempt to provide at least a degree of protection of the information from undesirable access.

1.3 Security Criteria: Reference Validation Systems

In response to the need for secure computer systems, the Department of Defense has issued a publication titled Department of Defense Trusted Computer System Evaluation Criteria (reference No. DOD 5200.28-STD). This publication is sometimes referred to as the "Orange Book," and is available from the Department of Defense. The Orange Book describes system security objectives and evaluation criteria for secure computer systems.

A "secure" computer system generally includes some type of "reference validation" system. These reference validation systems (known as reference monitors) are responsible for enforcing the security rules (security policy) for a given computer system.

Reference monitors mediate all access to "objects" by "subjects". Objects are passive entities that contain or receive information. Access to an object implies access to the information that it contains. Subjects are active entities, generally in the form of a person, process or device that cause information to flow among objects or change the system state. A subject may ordinarily reference its own, subject-internal information without the involvement of the reference monitor. Reference monitors controlling such access to objects by subjects are known in the art, and may utilize a security kernel approach.

1 Proper implementation of a reference monitor calls for adherence --
2 to three principles:

3
4 (1) completeness, in that all access by
5 subjects to objects or other subjects must
6 involve the monitor;

7
8 (2) isolation, in that the monitor must
9 be protected from tampering; and

10
11 (3) verifiability, in that correspondence
12 must be shown between the security policy
13 and the actual implementation of the monitor.

14
15 As discussed, every reference to information or change of
16 authorization should go through the reference monitor. Thus, all
17 commands issued by a user or other subject are monitored by the
18 reference monitor. This approach is particularly useful in multiuser
19 computer environments.

20
21 The totality of the protection mechanisms within a computer
22 system -- including hardware, software, and firmware, the combination of
23 which is responsible for enforcing a security policy -- is commonly
24 known as a "trusted computing base" (TCB). If the trusted software is

1 designed to be as simple as possible, for the sake of verifying the
2 reference monitor, then the trusted software is known as a "security
3 kernel".
4

5 Generally, TCBs attempt to meet the control objectives set out in
6 the Orange Book. Compliance with these objectives inspires user
7 confidence, and increases the overall desirability of a computer system.
8 These objectives deal with:
9

- 10 (1) security policy;
- 11 (2) accountability; and
- 12 (3) assurance.
13

14 The security policy objective entails enforcement by the TCB of
15 the desired security rules. These security rules are designed to limit the
16 access to and dissemination of information in a precisely defined
17 manner.
18

19 Security policies may include provisions for the enforcement of
20 both mandatory and discretionary access control rules. Mandatory
21 access control rules control access based directly on comparisons of the
22 user's security level and the sensitivity level of the information being
23 sought. Discretionary access rules control and limit access to identified
24 individuals who have been determined to have a need-to-know.

1
2 These access control rules call for associating with each user
3 identification code a statement indicating the user's access rights. This
4 statement often includes information representing the user's security level
5 (for mandatory control purposes), and membership in groups (for
6 discretionary control purposes).

7
8 The accountability objective calls for providing each user with an
9 individual user identification code (often called a "user name") and for
10 the TCB to be able to recognize the code and ensure that it is being
11 used by its proper user. This may be done by checking the user's
12 password. This ensuring the user's identity is known as "authentication."

13
14 In addition, the accountability requirement calls for the existence
15 of auditing capabilities. Such capabilities allow for the auditing of
16 actions which can cause access to, generation of, or release of classified
17 or sensitive information.

18 19 1.4 Assurance Objectives and "Trusted" Systems

20
21 The assurance objective is especially important in the present
22 context. That objective is concerned with taking steps to ensure that the
23 security policy is correctly implemented and that the TCB accurately
24 mediates and enforces the intent of that policy. Steps may be taken to

1 insure that each portion of the TCB is assured. To accomplish this
2 objective, two types of assurance are needed.

3
4 The first type of assurance is life-cycle assurance. This type of
5 assurance refers to steps taken to ensure that the computer system is
6 designed, developed, and maintained using formalized and rigorous
7 control standards.

8
9 The second type of assurance is operational assurance.
10 Operational assurance deals with the features and system architecture
11 used to ensure that the security policy is uncircumventably enforced
12 during system operation. All of the software (sometimes referred to
13 informally in the art as "code") in the TCB is generally analyzed to
14 determine the assurance level of the system.

15
16 As the amount of code in the TCB increases, it becomes more
17 difficult to ensure that the TCB accurately enforces the security policy.
18 Because of this, it is desirable to minimize the amount of trusted code,
19 and thus the complexity of the TCB.

20
21 A TCB is usually operated with a substantial amount of software,
22 such as text editors and other applications, operating within the security
23 policy of the TCB. Generally, this untrusted software asks the TCB for
24 access to objects when the user or the untrusted software requires them.

1 Thus, the majority of user's requests to the TCB, and the majority of the
2 information that a user obtains from the TCB, are handled through the
3 agency of untrusted software.
4

5 This untrusted software, however, is by nature in danger of
6 compromise and vulnerable to bugs. For some types of requests and
7 displays, malicious or malfunctioning untrusted software could
8 compromise the enforcement of the security policy. Generally, TCBs
9 cannot distinguish between requests faithfully made by the untrusted
10 software on command from a user and either requests made by the
11 untrusted software at its own initiative or requests that misrepresent the
12 user's actual command. For example, if commands issued by an
13 authorized user to change certain users' security levels were made
14 through the agency of untrusted software, it would be possible for
15 malicious or malfunctioning untrusted software to inappropriately raise
16 the security level of a user. Such inappropriate raising of a security
17 level could result in the disclosure of sensitive information.
18

19 Furthermore, TCBs generally cannot ensure that displays made by
20 untrusted software are faithful. This poses problems in that if displays
21 of audit records were made through the use of untrusted software it
22 would be possible for malicious untrusted software to misrepresent these
23 audit records to hide suspicious activities.
24

1 To overcome these problems, prior-art systems have developed a
2 concept known as a "trusted path." A trusted path is a mechanism by
3 which the user can communicate directly with the TCB. A trusted path
4 may only be activated by the user or the TCB and cannot be imitated
5 by untrusted code. Such a trusted path is a positive TCB-to-user
6 connection that bypasses all untrusted software. The Orange Book
7 requires a trusted path for all systems to have a security rank of B2 or
8 above.

9
10 A "trusted command" (also known as a trusted-path command) is
11 a command which requires a trusted path between the user and the TCB
12 for execution. The specific security policy of a computer system will
13 determine which commands are defined as trusted commands. For
14 example, commands relating to changes of the security levels of users
15 would be trusted commands.

16 17 1.5 Parsers as Increaseers of System Complexity

18
19 Because of perceived performance problems, prior-art computer
20 systems often included code to implement certain functions in the TCB.
21 One such function comprises a portion of code known as the "parser."

22
23 The parser performs the basic interpretation of user commands by
24 translating a human-readable representation of a user command (e.g., a

1 command typed by a user at a keyboard) into a machine-readable
2 representation known as the binary representation, or the parsed
3 command. A user command may consist of a group of words, typed by
4 the user, specifying some action to be taken. The user command may
5 also specify one or more variations or options of that action.
6

7 For the convenience of the user, most parsers allow these option
8 words to be typed in any order without changing the meaning of the
9 user command. Also, most parsers allow the user to type the words in
10 either full or abbreviated form. In some instances, several possible
11 abbreviations exist. Further, in most parsers, the user may vary the
12 spacing between the words without changing the meaning of the
13 command. Some parsers also check user commands for proper syntax,
14 and report errors to the user prior to execution of the command. Other
15 parsers prompt the user for missing information, avoiding the need to
16 completely retype an incomplete command.
17

18 Thus, several different inputted human-readable representations
19 may be associated with each unique parsed command. It is the job of
20 the parser to translate accurately these inputted representations of user
21 commands (which may vary with each user) into specific parsed
22 command representations. Due to the complex nature of parsing, large
23 amounts of computer code are generally associated with this activity.
24

1 Prior-art trusted software systems have included the parser for
2 trusted commands, and thus the associated code, within the TCB. In
3 these systems every trusted command was parsed and executed
4 exclusively by trusted code. The inclusion of the parsing code in the
5 TCB was regarded as necessary for proper system operation.
6

7 As discussed above, however, the ease and degree of assuring a
8 system is roughly inversely proportional to the complexity of the system's
9 TCB. Thus, the inclusion of the parser in the TCB results in more
10 complex assurance analysis and a corresponding decrease in system
11 confidence. Prior art devices (since they needed to be small and simple
12 to support assurance) have thereby inherently constrained the user-
13 friendliness of computer systems.
14

15 2. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

16

17 The present invention provides a number of advantages over the
18 prior art. By reducing the complexity of the TCB, the amount of trusted
19 code that must be verified or assured is reduced. In addition, the
20 general usability of the system is increased, because the improved
21 method of processing trusted commands allows for the implementation of
22 added computing functions at little or no additional cost in TCB
23 assurance.
24

1 The present invention includes an improved method for the
2 execution of trusted commands. In this improved method, the required
3 steps for processing a trusted command are split between trusted and
4 untrusted code. In this manner the amount of trusted code in the TCB
5 may be significantly reduced.

6
7 As discussed above, the parsing of a command can be compara-
8 tively difficult, and often requires large amounts of complex code.
9 However, it is relatively simple to translate the parsed representation of
10 a command into a standard human-readable representation for display to
11 the user. This is in part because a single, standard human-readable
12 display representation may be associated with each parsed representation.
13 The present invention takes advantage of this fact by parsing the trusted
14 commands in untrusted code prior to execution in the TCB.

15
16 In general, the present invention includes a computer system
17 which includes a TCB operating as a reference monitor. Included in the
18 TCB is the security-relevant code necessary for the actual execution of a
19 trusted command.

20
21 Associated with the TCB are one or more untrusted subjects (e.g.
22 processes). Each such subject has particular access rights, which may
23 include a security level. These untrusted subjects communicate only with
24 the involvement of the TCB. The TCB allows communication only as

1 permitted by the system's security policy. Each untrusted subject is
2 substantially independent.

3
4 In each of these untrusted subjects, untrusted software is generally
5 run. This untrusted software may include an untrusted operating system
6 (UOS), and generally includes applications such as text editors. In the
7 present invention, the untrusted code includes the non-security relevant
8 functions necessary for the execution of a trusted command.

9
10 Attached to the computer system are several user terminals.
11 These user terminals allow the user to exchange information with the
12 computer system. All terminal activity is seen first by the TCB. A
13 secure-attention key is dedicated for use on each terminal attached to
14 the computer system. The TCB is designed to recognize and trap this
15 key signal. Activation of this key by the user establishes a trusted path
16 between the user terminal and the TCB. Alternate methods for
17 establishing a trusted path may be utilized.

18
19 The TCB is generally provided with a limited number of
20 "direct" user commands (direct commands). Because of this, the majority
21 of the user's activities will take place in the untrusted operating system.

22
23 While operating in the UOS, the user may attempt to execute a
24 trusted command. When one of these commands is issued by the user,

1 the untrusted code in the UOS checks the syntax of the command and
2 may prompt for missing parameters; then the untrusted parser converts
3 the command into a parsed representation that will be referred to here
4 for convenience as the "binary representation." In some instances,
5 command procedures and application-issued trusted commands will also
6 be parsed and translated into a binary representation.

7
8 This binary representation is then passed from the UOS to the
9 TCB. The TCB initially associates the binary representation with a
10 physical terminal, and copies the binary representation into a memory
11 buffer assigned to that terminal.

12
13 Once this has been completed, the untrusted code in the UOS
14 may prompt the user to activate the secure-attention key. If this key is
15 activated, a trusted path will be established between the user terminal
16 and the TCB. Alternate methods may be employed to initiate this
17 trusted path. A randomly generated process ID, which may be
18 generated at login, may be utilized to prevent untrusted code from
19 simulating a trusted path.

20
21 Subsequent activity by the TCB depends on the type of command
22 that is represented by the binary representation. If the command is one
23 that will not modify any information, i.e., a request to view information,
24 the TCB verifies that the user has the necessary access rights, and

1 attempts to execute the binary representation. A human-readable
2 standard representation of the binary command received by the TCB is
3 displayed along with the information.
4

5 In most instances, if the command requested by the user requests
6 modification of information, the TCB displays for confirmation a
7 standard human-readable form of the command, along with an indication
8 of what the result of command execution will be. The user is then
9 requested to confirm (by typing a response via the trusted path) that the
10 displayed command was received correctly and should be executed.
11

12 This confirmation allows the user to ensure that untrusted code
13 has not performed an unauthorized modification of the user's original
14 command. Also, confirmation allows for the detection by the user of
15 any errors that may have occurred during the parsing process. In
16 situations where the binary representation represents a command
17 procedure or an application-issued trusted command, the confirmation
18 ensures that the command proposed by the untrusted software is
19 acceptable to the user.
20

21 If the command is confirmed by the user, the TCB checks to
22 ensure that the user has the necessary access rights to execute the
23 command and, if so, attempts to execute the command.
24

1 A distinct advantage of the present invention arises from the fact
2 that the execution of a trusted command is split between trusted code
3 and untrusted code. The actual parsing of the command occurs in
4 untrusted code. The trusted code included in the TCB checks the
5 parsed command for correctness and displays it to the user in human
6 readable form. This checking and display of a parsed command requires
7 substantially less code than is required to parse a command.

8
9 Thus, since the command parser is included in the untrusted code,
10 the amount of trusted code in the TCB is minimized. This lowers the
11 difficulty of trusted system assurance, and increases the amount of
12 confidence that may be placed in a system.

13
14 It is a further advantage of this invention that the user interface
15 is separate from the underlying functions performed by the TCB. This
16 allows for implementation of alternate UOS-to-user interfaces without
17 major modification of the TCB. Further, the amount of time and effort
18 to develop such a command interface is reduced. A still further
19 advantage is that more useability features may be provided without
20 substantially increasing the complexity of the TCB. Examples of such
21 useability features are command line editing and recall.

3. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 illustrates the various levels within a computer system;

Figure 2 illustrates various layers within the trusted computing base;

Figure 3 illustrates a trusted path;

Figures 4A and 4B are flow diagrams representing a method for processing trusted commands. Differences in box representation in these drawings is explained below.

Figure 5 illustrates one method of implementing the invention;

Figure 6 is a flow diagram representing a method for verifying a trusted path;

Figure 7 is a state transition diagram of a further embodiment utilizing various command states.

4. DESCRIPTION OF SPECIFIC EMBODIMENTS

A specific embodiment of the present invention is described with respect to a computer which supports various user processes and may operate in a multiuser environment. As an illustration, an implementation in connection with a VAX model computer, available from Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC), is briefly described. It should be understood that the present invention may be readily applied to various types of computer systems including PC networks, stand-alone multiuser computer systems, or single user computer systems, to name a few examples.

4.1 Overview of Software Architecture

FIG.1 illustrates a preferred computing environment which is generally designated by the reference numeral 2. A trusted computing base (TCB) 10 resides at the center of the computer system. The TCB 10 acts as a reference monitor in that access to information is mediated by the TCB 10.

In a general embodiment of the invention, the TCB 10 may be a secure kernel residing under the general operating system of a computer system. In one embodiment, the TCB 10 comprises trusted code residing underneath a VMS or Ultrix system.

1
2 The TCB 10 enforces a security policy which identifies permissible
3 modes of access between users or computer processes (subjects) and
4 files, memory segments or other objects. Access to stored information is
5 mediated by the TCB 10, so that the TCB 10 may determine whether a
6 particular user or untrusted subject can access particular information. In
7 order for the TCB 10 to fulfill its protective function, it must take into
8 account the three requirements discussed above: (1) completeness, (2)
9 isolation, and (3) verifiability.

10
11 A more complete understanding of the TCB 10 may be obtained
12 by reference to FIG.2. As is illustrated, the TCB 10 may comprise
13 several distinct layers. Each layer of the TCB 10 comprises trusted
14 code. This trusted status is indicated by the security boundary 11. In
15 one embodiment, layers of particular interest are the layers to be
16 referred to as: secure server (SSVR) 12, Command Conveyor (CC) 14,
17 and VTerm (VT) 16.

18
19 The TCB 10 includes the trusted code necessary to ensure
20 compliance with the Orange Book requirements. In alternate
21 embodiments, the trusted code may ensure compliance with different
22 systems of security requirements. The TCB 10 also includes the code
23 which actually executes the requested trusted command, as discussed
24 below.

Each untrusted subject is generally supported by an untrusted process. This process may spend time in one of two "modes." The first mode, in which the process usually runs, is known as a "user mode." This mode is a restricted hardware state such as the VAX user mode that is known in the art. This process may also spend time executing trusted code in an all-powerful hardware state. This state is represented by the VAX "kernel mode", which is known in the art. This state may be triggered by a request by the untrusted subject of the security kernel. Such a request may be made in a conventional manner and is commonly called a "kernel call." This mode may also be triggered by asynchronous events (e.g. the completion of an Input/Output request previously made by the untrusted subject).

In one embodiment, the TCB 10 also has one process associated with each terminal that communicates with the user over the trusted path. This process is known in the art as an "execution thread." In this embodiment, each execution thread shares its address space with other TCB execution threads. An advantage of such sharing is economy of machine resources. Full-blown processes, each with its own address space, would require far more machine resources than if such address space sharing is employed.

1 It is the CC 14 which provides the interprocess communication
2 for passing parsed commands between the processes that support the
3 untrusted subjects, and the processes within the TCB 10 that support the
4 trusted path.

5
6 The untrusted code may submit to the TCB 10 the parsed
7 representation of the trusted command by making a kernel call. The
8 kernel call causes the process supporting the untrusted subject to switch
9 to the all-powerful hardware state and to begin to execute trusted code
10 designed to handle kernel calls. This trusted code recognizes the nature
11 of the kernel call and calls the CC 14. The CC 14 then obtains and
12 copies the binary representation of the trusted command into protected
13 memory and puts it in a global data structure that supports the user
14 process associated with the terminal in question.

15
16 The VT 16 layer includes the trusted code which monitors all
17 terminal activity and checks for activation of the secure-attention key.
18 In one particular embodiment, the VT 16 layer also includes code which
19 tracks which physical terminal is associated with a particular user or
20 untrusted subject.

21
22 The specific manner of implementation of the above described
23 activities will be apparent to one skilled in the art having the benefit of
24 this disclosure.

1
2 Referring to FIGS 1 and 3, "around" the TCB 10 is a general
3 untrusted operating system (UOS) 20. The UOS 20 generally comprises
4 untrusted code and may include a traditional operating system such as
5 Ultrix or VMS. Alternate constructions are envisioned where the UOS
6 20 includes any untrusted code. It will be appreciated that the system
7 may include untrusted code that is separate from TCB 10 and UOS 20.
8

9 Most user activity will occur in the UOS 20. In one embodiment,
10 a specific UOS 20 may run in each untrusted subject.
11

12 4.2 User Terminals and the Secure-Attention Key

13

14 Associated with the computer system are one or more user
15 terminals 30. These terminals 30 may be conventional in construction,
16 in that they allow the user to exchange information with the computer
17 system. Either "intelligent" or "dumb" terminals may be used. Examples
18 of such dumb terminals are the well-known VT series 200 and 300
19 terminals. These terminals are available from Digital Equipment
20 Corporation or its authorized dealers.
21

22 A particularly useful terminal includes control programming that is
23 designed with security features in mind, such as is described in a co-
24 pending U.S. patent application entitled "Method for Securing Terminal

1 and Terminal Apparatus for Use with the Method," Serial No. 456,672, = =
2 filed by Wei-Ming Hu, Clifford E. Kahn, Andrew H. Mason, and Peter
3 A. Sichel on December 26, 1989 and to be commonly assigned with this
4 application.
5

6 A keyboard is attached to each user terminal. Each keyboard
7 includes a key employed as a secure-attention key. This key is utilized
8 to establish a trusted path between a user terminal and the TCB 10. In
9 one embodiment, the secure-attention key is an "out-of-band key" for the
10 UOS 20. It is desirable that the signal sent by the terminal upon
11 activation of the secure-attention key is generally not utilized by the
12 applications running in the UOS 20. An out-of-band key is convenient
13 since it does not restrict the traditional number of user keys and the
14 signal is sent immediately, even if other I/O is pending. For example,
15 the secure-attention key may be the BREAK key on the terminal
16 keyboard.
17

18 In many terminals (such as the VT 2XX and VT 3XX families)
19 locking of the keyboard prevents the transmission of several key signals.
20 In these terminals, however, the BREAK key signal may be transmitted,
21 even from a locked keyboard. Thus it is generally desirable to employ
22 the BREAK key as the secure-attention key. Also, the signal generated
23 by activation of the BREAK key comes in ahead of other characters in
24 the keyboard buffer. A further advantage of utilizing the BREAK key is

1 that software running in the UOS 20 cannot get the terminal to send
2 that character.

3 4 4.3 The Trusted Path and Direct Commands

5
6 The TCB 10 generally operates as a reference monitor.

7
8 Upon initial login or at other times when the user is not
9 connected to a process in the UOS 20 (e.g., an application program), the
10 TCB 10 responds to a comparatively limited series of "direct commands,"
11 which may include a CONNECT command to connect to an untrusted
12 subject. When the user is connected to such an untrusted subject, the
13 TCB 10 checks for the secure-attention signal; if a signal other than the
14 secure-attention signal is received, the TCB 10 passes the signal to the
15 connected untrusted subject.

16
17 As discussed above, in one specific embodiment the trusted code
18 in the VT layer 16 monitors all terminal activity. When the code in the
19 VT 16 notices that the BREAK key has been depressed, the SSVR is
20 signaled in a conventional manner (such as by advancing an event count
21 or activating a flag). Code in the SSVR 12 recognizes this signaling and
22 establishes a trusted path between the user terminal and itself. In this
23 manner, the secure-attention key signal is trapped by the TCB 10.

1 In certain security environments, general security requirements
2 mandate that the TCB 10 make displays when a trusted path is
3 established and exited by the user. In one embodiment, when a trusted
4 path is established, the TCB 10 sends a reset command sequence to the
5 physical user terminal 30 to assure that it is in a known state. This is
6 done in part to ensure that the information displayed to the user by the
7 TCB 10 is in the intended form, (e.g., correct font). A particularly
8 useful sequence of commands to implement the reset command sequence
9 is described in the aforementioned copending U.S. patent application by
10 Hu et al.

11
12 When the secure-attention key is activated, other than in
13 connection with the issuance of a trusted command, the secure server 12
14 displays a particular banner and prompt (for example: "SSVR>" together
15 with the user's process identifier, discussed below), to indicate that the
16 user is conversing interactively with trusted code. If the secure-attention
17 key was activated in connection with the issuance of a trusted command,
18 the secure server 12 displays to the user some indication of what is to
19 be done, as discussed below.

20
21 When command execution is complete, or when the user
22 establishes or reactivates a session with the UOS 20, the TCB 10 issues
23 a message to inform the user that he/she is breaking the trusted path.
24 When a session with the TCB is complete, the memory in the physical

1 terminal may be cleared by the TCB. This is done to protect trusted
2 information from both untrusted code and unclassified persons who may
3 later use the terminal. A particularly advantageous method of clearing
4 the terminal memory is described in the aforementioned co-pending
5 patent application.

6
7 The number of direct user commands available from the TCB 10
8 is preferably limited to reduce the complexity of the TCB 10. Generally,
9 a command is direct if:

10
11 a. one needs the command when one
12 is not connected to an untrusted subject;

13
14 b. end users depend on the com-
15 mand's correct behavior for security (e.g.,
16 LOGOUT); or

17
18 c. the command must be issued when
19 no user process in the UOS 20 is running.

20
21 In most cases, the user will converse with the TCB 10 through the
22 SSVR 12. In one embodiment the user conversing with the SSVR 12
23 may be restricted to commands which allow him/her to establish
24 (connect) or end (disconnect) a computing session in the general UOS

1 20. Further commands may be added, such as allowing the user to view
2 the existing UOS 20 sessions or change his or her password, but it is
3 generally desirable to limit the number of available commands in the
4 TCB 10. It is further desirable to ensure simplicity in the syntax of
5 these direct commands.
6

7 The simple syntax of the direct commands, and the comparatively
8 small amounts of code necessary to interpret these commands, do not
9 substantially increase the complexity of the TCB 10.
10

11 4.4 Login Processing by the TCB 12

13 To initiate a computing session in the illustrative UOS 20, the
14 user may first login to the computing environment through the SSVR 12.
15 To initiate a login, the user activates the secure-attention key (or
16 performs some other action to gain the attention of the SSVR 12). As
17 discussed above, this establishes a trusted path between the user terminal
18 and the TCB 10. Alternate embodiments are envisioned wherein other
19 methods are employed to establish a trusted path.
20

21 Once a trusted path has been established, the SSVR 12 prompts
22 the user for his/her specific user name and password. The various
23 layers in the TCB 10 perform well-known security checks to ensure that
24 the user has the necessary access rights to login at the terminal. If the

1 user possesses the required access rights, a computing session is
2 established in the SSVR 12.

3
4 At this time, the user's security information is stored by the TCB
5 10. The TCB 10 also stores in memory a unique identifier of the user
6 process. This information is maintained in memory by the TCB 10 as
7 long as the user has an active session.

8 9 4.5 Connection to Untrusted Process

10
11 Because the number of direct user commands in the TCB 10 is
12 preferably limited, the user will generally choose to establish a
13 computing session with an untrusted subject. Such an untrusted subject
14 may include application programs residing in the UOS 20.

15
16 In one specific embodiment, when the user establishes a
17 computing session in the UOS 20, the user's physical terminal 30 is
18 associated with a virtual terminal of the UOS. The user converses with
19 the untrusted subject through a computing session within the UOS 20.
20 When such a connection with an untrusted subject is made, the VT layer
21 16 of the TCB 10 stores in memory which physical terminal 30 is
22 associated with which virtual terminal in an untrusted subject. In this
23 manner, trusted commands received from an untrusted subject may be
24 attributed to the actual user at the physical terminal 30. Once the user

1 has established a computing session within the UOS 20, normal
2 computing activities may be carried out.

3
4 A more detailed understanding of these activities may be obtained
5 through reference to FIG.4A and 4B. Activities indicated by heavily
6 bordered blocks are performed by the TCB 10, or trusted code.
7 Activities represented by lightly bordered blocks are performed by
8 untrusted code.

9
10 In FIG.4A, the user terminal is represented as having established
11 a computing session 100 within the general UOS 20. During the session,
12 the user may attempt to execute various commands. Utilities within the
13 UOS 20 determine whether the issued commands are trusted commands
14 50. If the command is not identified by the UOS 20 as a trusted
15 command, the UOS 20 attempts to perform the command at process 60.
16 In these cases the operation and existence of the TCB 10 may have little
17 effect on the command's behavior as seen by the user.

18 19 4.6 The Process Identifier

20
21 In one embodiment, a process identifier (process ID) is associated
22 with each user process at the time of login. This process ID is a
23 pseudo-randomly generated alpha-numeric tag which is associated with
24 the user throughout his/her computing session.

1 The process ID is useful if the untrusted code can temporarily
2 disable or delay the effect of activation of the secure-attention key. For
3 example, untrusted code can send a reset command to some terminals.
4 While these terminals are resetting, activation of the secure-attention key
5 has no effect. Such a technique may allow untrusted code to trick the
6 user into thinking a trusted path had been established when it had not
7 been. The process ID inhibits such trickery by allowing the user to
8 distinguish between actual and emulated trusted paths.

9
10 When the user first logs in, he/she will not yet know the process
11 ID and cannot detect a false trusted path. However, to simulate a login
12 dialogue, untrusted code would have to guess when the user activated
13 the secure-attention key, or somehow detect the activation of the key
14 even though the TCB could not detect it. Guessing the activation time
15 is impracticable, because users start login dialogues at their own
16 convenience and give no advance signal to the TCB prior to activation
17 of the secure-attention key. Detecting the secure-attention key even
18 though the TCB could not detect it would be possible only by causing
19 the key to yield a signal different than the TCB expects. Methods to
20 prevent such an event are described in the co-pending application by Hu
21 et al., referenced above.

22
23 With some terminals, the untrusted code may be able to program
24 the terminal so that the secure-attention key generates a signal that is

1 recognizable to the untrusted code, but not to the TCB. In these cases, --
2 generation of the process ID at the time of login would be
3 unsatisfactory. Instead, the process ID may be generated prior to user
4 login. For example, in these embodiments, the process ID may be
5 generated when the user is registered with the TCB 10 and stored in
6 protected memory. In this embodiment the user may be given a way of
7 changing his/her process ID, just as the user can generally change their
8 password.

9
10 In one particular embodiment, when the user logs in the SSVR 12
11 pseudo-randomly generates a process ID and assigns this ID to the
12 specific user at the physical terminal. Methods of generating pseudo-
13 random identifiers are generally known in the art. In one embodiment,
14 the random number initial seed is based on a hardware (as opposed to a
15 software) event. The algorithm for generating successive random
16 numbers should be computationally difficult to invert.

17
18 This process ID is maintained in the TCB and is never provided
19 to untrusted code. Thus, untrusted code in the general UOS 20 is
20 prevented from discovering the specific process ID assigned to the user.

21
22 The user is responsible for noting and retaining his/her assigned
23 process ID. To promote user retention the process ID may be
24 generated as a pronounceable group of characters. Methods for such

1 generating pronounceable passwords are described in "A Random Word
2 Generator", MITRE Technical Report (MTR-3006), May, 1975, by
3 Morrie Gasser.

4
5 The process ID is displayed to the user when a trusted path is
6 established between the user terminal and the SSVR 12. Displaying the
7 ID serves a useful security function as it inhibits untrusted code from
8 "spoofing" the user. Absent the process ID it may be possible for an
9 untrusted subject to emulate the SSVR 12. An untrusted subject,
10 emulating the SSVR 12, may be able to trick the user into divulging
11 security-relevant information or otherwise compromising system security.

12
13 The process ID, known only to the user and the SSVR 12,
14 inhibits this type of "spoofing." Before the user responds to an apparent
15 SSVR 12 request, he/she will first verify that the proper process ID is
16 displayed. Since the process ID is known by only the user and the
17 SSVR 12, it is extremely difficult for an untrusted subject, ignorant of
18 the process ID, to fool the user into believing that he/she is conversing
19 with the SSVR 12.

20
21 FIG.6 illustrates a flow diagram of this process. When the user
22 initially logs into the computer system through the SSVR 12, a randomly
23 generated process ID is assigned to the user. This activity is represented
24 by process 310. In one embodiment, this process ID comprises

1 alphabetic characters and is pronounceable. The pronounceable nature
2 promotes user retention of the ID. The process ID is then stored in
3 trusted memory by the SSVR 12 and displayed to the user by the SSVR
4 12 at process 320.

5
6 During the course of the computing session, the TCB determines
7 if the user is operating through a trusted path. This activity occurs at
8 process 330. If the TCB determines that a trusted path is not
9 established, the process ID will not be displayed to the user. This is
10 noted at process 350.

11
12 The process ID is maintained in trusted code and memory, and is
13 inaccessible to untrusted subjects. Each time a trusted path is
14 established between the SSVR 12 and the user, the SSVR 12 displays
15 the user's process ID at process 340. By observing the displayed ID, the
16 user is assured that an actual trusted path has been established.

17 18 4.7 The Command Conveyor

19 As discussed above, the command conveyor (CC) 14 is a layer in
20 the TCB 10 which comprises part of the trusted code. The CC 14 is
21 utilized to ensure proper communication of trusted commands between
22 the SSVR 12 and the process supporting the untrusted subject. As
23 discussed, such an untrusted subject may include a UOS 20.
24

1 Associated with each physical terminal 30 is a command buffer.
2 In some embodiments, a status code may be associated with each
3 terminal. In a still other embodiments, one of five command states is
4 also associated with each physical terminal. The command buffer is
5 used to store the binary representation of the trusted command. The
6 status code may be employed to provide the resulting execution status to
7 the untrusted subject. The command states generally comprise five
8 possibilities:

- 10 (a) no command,
- 11 (b) command submitted,
- 12 (c) command in progress,
- 13 (d) ignore finish, and
- 14 (e) command done.

15
16 These states are used to indicate the various states that may be
17 encountered in the execution of a trusted command. FIG. 7 is state
18 transition of the command states. A detailed explanation of these states
19 and the statuses may be obtained from the following discussion.

20 21 4.8 Distribution of Processing of Trusted Commands

22
23 As discussed above, the TCB 10 "recognizes" two categories of
24 commands. For the purposes of this specification "commands" include

1 user instructions received through the use of command line interfaces,
2 menu interfaces, direct manipulation interfaces or the like.

3
4 The first category includes "direct commands" issued while the
5 user is operating in the SSVR 12 layer of the TCB 10, i.e., is
6 interactively conversing with the TCB 10. As discussed above, it is
7 desirable to limit the number of direct commands available to the user.
8 The execution and processing of these direct commands is carried out
9 using traditional methods known in the art.

10
11 The second category includes "trusted commands." These
12 commands are issued by a user operating in a non-trusted computing
13 environment, such as in the general UOS 20. In one embodiment these
14 trusted commands are issued by a user operating in an untrusted virtual
15 machine. FIGS.4A and 4B illustrate the activity necessary to execute
16 such a command.

17
18 If the user attempts to execute a trusted command, the parser
19 residing in the general UOS 20 parses the trusted command string and
20 converts it into a binary representation at process 70. In parsing the
21 command, the untrusted code in the UOS 20 checks syntax and
22 semantics, and prompts for missing parameters. Parsing strategies are
23 well known in the art and will not be discussed herein.

1 From a security perspective, it is not required that the code in the
2 UOS 20 perform an accurate translation of the user's commands into a
3 parsed representation (binary representation). The confirmation
4 mechanism, described below, is designed to catch such errors whether
5 benign or malevolent.
6

7 Following parsing of the command, a process supporting the UOS
8 20 issues a call to the TCB, submitting to the TCB the identification of
9 the terminal from which such command was issued, at process 80. In
10 one embodiment, the virtual terminal from which the command was
11 issued is submitted to the TCB. Such a call is processed by the CC 14
12 in the TCB 10. The CC 14 then determines which trusted subject
13 submitted the command and copies the parsed representation into
14 protected memory at process 90. In one embodiment this determination
15 is made by asking VTerm to identify the physical terminal associated
16 with the UOS's virtual terminal.
17

18 Such a submission of the binary representation will be successful
19 only if the TCB 10 determines that the submitting terminal is connected
20 to an active process.
21

22 Normally, in embodiments utilizing the command states, the
23 command state of the submitting physical terminal is no command, which
24 indicates that there is no trusted command submitted by that physical

1 terminal or in progress. This state is represented by state 400 in FIG. 7.

2 When the state is no command, the CC 14 saves the binary
3 representation in the command buffer, and sets the physical terminal's
4 state to command submitted, represented by transition state 410.

5 Otherwise, the submission fails.

6
7 When the untrusted subject running in untrusted code receives
8 indication from the TCB 10 that the command has been submitted, it
9 requests the user to activate the secure-attention key. In one
10 embodiment, the untrusted code in the UOS 20 will request that the
11 user activate the BREAK key.

12
13 If the user activates a cancellation key, for example Ctrl-Y or
14 Ctrl-C, instead of activating the secure-attention key, code in the general
15 UOS 20 may cancel the trusted command. This can be accomplished by
16 the untrusted code issuing a kernel call (i.e., a request by the untrusted
17 subject of the security kernel) and informing the CC 14 that the
18 command is to be aborted. If the CC 14 finds that the command has
19 not been sent to the SSVR 12, the command is canceled. Similarly, if
20 the user process in the UOS 20 is killed, the process rundown code may
21 cancel the trusted command request. However, if the CC 14 finds that
22 the command has already been sent it proceeds; because the user is
23 already executing the command.

1 In embodiments employing command states, cancellation of the
2 trusted command request results in the command state being changed
3 from command submitted to no command. This process is indicated in
4 FIG. 7.

5
6 If the user attempts to establish a trusted path at the same time
7 the trusted command is sent to the TCB 10, then the TCB 10 must
8 arbitrate; either of these requests may be processed first. If the secure-
9 attention signal is processed first, the TCB 10 may defer the command
10 submission, and a connection with the SSVR 12 is established. If the
11 submission is processed first, then the user sees the confirmation screen
12 as is described below.

13
14 If, when prompted, the user activates the secure-attention key, a
15 trusted path is established between the user's physical terminal 30 and
16 the SSVR 12 in the TCB 10. This configuration is illustrated by the
17 dark line in FIG.3. When the VT layer 16 detects the secure-attention
18 (BREAK) key, it notifies the SSVR 12 which then establishes a trusted
19 path in the trusted path-supporting process associated with the user's
20 physical terminal 30.

21
22 Once the trusted path is established, the TCB 10 maintains
23 exclusive control over the physical terminal 30. In one embodiment,
24 untrusted code in the UOS 20 waits to be notified that the command

1 has been completed. Thus, the user essentially bypasses the untrusted
2 code, and converses only with trusted code. Thus, if the user's process
3 in the general UOS 20 is killed, or the user's process terminates, or the
4 general UOS 20 crashes, the trusted command may still be executed.
5 The user will not be informed of any of these activities until the trusted
6 command has been completed or abandoned.

7
8 Following establishment of the trusted path, the security
9 requirements of the system require interaction between the user and the
10 SSVR 12. This is necessary to execute commands which require the
11 establishment of a trusted path. The Orange Book criteria, and/or the
12 system's security goals, will determine which commands require this
13 interaction as is generally discussed in Section 4.9 below.

14
15 The establishment of a trusted path in these instances is useful
16 for several reasons. First, it allows the secure server to identify the
17 specific user issuing the command. Second, the trusted path allows the
18 user to review and approve (or reject) the requested action in a trusted
19 fashion. This reduces the possibility of malicious untrusted software
20 altering a command request, and allows for the detection of parsing
21 errors.

22
23 FIG.4B illustrates the activity occurring after control has passed to
24 the TCB 10. As discussed above, the TCB 10 first establishes a trusted

1 path at process 120. The TCB then checks to see if a trusted command = =
2 has been submitted by the user. Untrusted code may then wait for the
3 command to finish.
4

5 Once a trusted path has been established, the SSVR 12 will call
6 the CC 14 to return the binary representation at process 130. In one
7 embodiment, the CC 14 will first determine the command state of the
8 physical user terminal 30. In a still further embodiment if the command
9 state is command submitted 410 (FIG. 7), the CC 14 will return to the
10 SSVR 12 the binary representation, and change the command state to
11 command in progress 420. If the state is no command 400 or command
12 done 430, the call will fail, and the SSVR 12 will display the SSVR
13 prompt (SSVR>) to the user. An initial command state of command in
14 progress 420 or ignore finish 440 implies a bug in the SSVR 12 and may
15 result in the CC 14 crashing the TCB 10.
16

17 In these embodiments, if the command state was command
18 submitted 410, then the CC 14 will return to the SSVR 12 the binary
19 representation of the requested command.
20

21 4.9 Display of Command to User 22

23 Once the parsed command has been returned to the SSVR 12,
24 the SSVR 12 will determine if the command requires confirmation at

1 process 140 (FIG. 4B). Confirmation should generally be required for
2 commands which request modification of information. Commands that
3 do not alter the information, such as the viewing of information, should
4 not generally require confirmation. For purposes of confirmation,
5 redirecting the display into a file should be considered as viewing
6 information.

7
8 The decision of whether a given command should require
9 activation of the secure-attention key to execute depends on the basic
10 security policy of the system. In one embodiment, secure-attention
11 trusted commands are a mechanism for use by system managers, security
12 managers, operators, and holders of special privileges.

13
14 Generally, a command which is not a direct command, is a
15 secure-attention command if:
16

17 a. it modifies a security kernel
18 database in a security-relevant way; or

19
20 b. it displays information on which a
21 systems manager, security manager, or
22 operator will base a security decision.
23

1 If the command is one that does not require confirmation, the
2 TCB 10 enforces the system's security policy and determine if the user
3 has the necessary access rights to execute the command at process 145.
4 If this is the case the TCB 10 attempts to execute the binary
5 representation at process 150. Since certain commands, e.g. commands
6 that merely display information, do not change the state of the system,
7 user confirmation is not required. There is no security problem in not
8 confirming these commands since the system only allows users to view
9 information to which they have access.

10
11 There are certain commands that change the state of the system
12 may not require confirmation. Some commands may allow the user to
13 turn on a file to receive the user's redirected output. This files are
14 sometimes known in the art as "listing files." Generally, the turning on
15 of a listing file is a confirmed command.

16
17 In situations where a listing file has been turned on (i.e., the
18 output is redirected into this file) commands which normally display
19 information may, by writing to the listing file, alter the state of the
20 system. In these cases, confirmation of these commands is generally not
21 required because the flow of information is constrained by the TCB's
22 security rules.

1 When a command requesting the display of information is
2 executed by the TCB 10, the SSVR 12 responds by displaying a
3 complete representation of the requested command as well as the
4 requested information, i.e. the standard human-readable representation of
5 the command. In one embodiment, the SSVR 12 displays the function
6 code, command modifiers, and command parameters all in unambiguous
7 notation. If employed, the process ID may also be displayed.

8
9 Thus, if the user's command is improperly parsed, or modified in
10 an unauthorized manner, the user will be able to observe the difference.
11 This inhibits an untrusted subject from fooling a user into believing that
12 he or she is observing the results of a submitted command, when in fact
13 that command had actually been altered.

14
15 If the command requested is one for which confirmation is
16 required, the SSVR 12 displays a standard human-readable
17 representation of what is about to be done to the user terminal at
18 process 170. The code representing each command should produce a
19 different display, unless the commands have the same effect. As
20 previously discussed, the re-display of the action that a binary
21 representation will perform is less complex than the parsing of the
22 original command. This is in part because by definition there is only
23 one standard human-readable representation for each parsed command.

1 By parsing the command in untrusted code, and verifying the
2 request in trusted code, the overall complexity of the TCB 10 is
3 decreased. The display of "what is about to be done" may of course
4 vary from one command to another.
5

6 If the command's purpose is to add a record to a database or
7 create an object, the display may contain what the new record will
8 contain, or what the attributes of the object will be if the command is
9 confirmed.
10

11 If a particular database or object is to be modified, the display
12 may show what the updated data will look like, or what the attributes of
13 the object will be if the command is confirmed. For commands which
14 remove an existing object, or delete an existing file, the display may
15 show the record or object.
16

17 Generally, for both adding/creating and modifying, the data
18 packet representing the submitted command may contain fields for the
19 objects attributes, such as its name, its size and its protection. For each
20 of these fields, the packet may also have a flag indicating whether the
21 field is meaningful. These flags indicating meaningful fields may be
22 know as "field selectors."
23

1 In add/create commands, the TCB may supply default values for
2 unselected fields. In commands which modify a database entry or object,
3 unselected fields may retain their previous values.

4
5 To aid the user, the selected fields may be highlighted when
6 displayed for confirmation. Such highlighting may be accomplished by
7 methods known in the art (e.g., by using escape sequences that begin
8 and end reverse video). This highlighting draws the users attention to
9 the fields that have non-default or changed values and helps to protect
10 the user from tricks by untrusted code.

11
12 When an audit record is produced of the confirmation display via
13 the sink (discussed below) the reverse-video escape sequences may be
14 replaced with dashes on the next line. Example:

15
16 Name: JOHN.DOE
17 - - - -

18 This change permits the audit record to be properly displayed on
19 a wide variety of devices, even simple line printers.

20
21 Alternative embodiments are envisioned in which the TCB checks
22 each field's value: for add/create commands the fields that have non-
23 default values are highlighted; and for modify commands the fields that

1 are changing are highlighted. This "field comparison" approach generally --
2 results in less highlighting.

3
4 Generally, for every command, every packet field is displayed on
5 the screen, except for fields ignored by the particular command.

6
7 In the cases when a database will not be modified, the display
8 generated by the SSVR 12 may express what action is to be done. In
9 this manner, the possibility of an erroneous confirmation is reduced since
10 the user is requested to confirm the results, not the command.

11
12 The SSVR 12 may also display a list of user protection attributes
13 so that the user knows what role he or she is exercising. The user is
14 required to confirm explicitly (Yes or No) the action requested. In a
15 general embodiment, the TCB 12 displays for confirmation the results
16 which would occur if the command is executed.

17
18 Generally, any information in the binary representation that is
19 displayed is first validated. This information is checked once to ensure
20 that certain requirements are met, e.g., to ensure that the counts of
21 array elements are within array bounds (since out-of-bounds conditions
22 could provide an opportunity for entry into the TCB by illicit software).

1 Before displaying the contents of a packet containing the binary
2 representation of the command, anything that could cause the formatting
3 code to malfunction may be validated. Generally, such candidates for
4 validation could include anything used to index into something else.
5 Specific examples include the PASCAL language's implementation of
6 varying strings (a count followed by an array of characters; the count is
7 checked to be less than or equal to the character array size), and
8 numbers that represent keywords (their value is checked before it is
9 used to index into an array of keyword text strings). Further methods of
10 validation are well known in the art and will not be discussed herein.

11
12 In one embodiment, the replies that the user may make to the
13 confirmation prompt are "yes", "no", Ctrl-C, Ctrl-Y, or the BREAK key.
14 No default responses exist in this embodiment. For each user response,
15 the secure server may display a message restating the response. If the
16 response was "yes" or "no", the secure server 12 displays an indication of
17 the computing session in the UOS 20 when it is being resumed after
18 command completion.

19
20 If, however, the user activates the Ctrl-Y, Ctrl-C, or the BREAK
21 key, the command will be aborted. In one embodiment, the CC then
22 changes the command status code to negative. This may be done to
23 inform the submitting process that the command has been aborted. In
24 these cases a direct session with the SSVR 12 will be established at

1 process 300. In these instances, the user must explicitly issue a resume
2 command to return to the session in the UOS 20.
3

4 If the user confirms the results or command, by replying with
5 "yes", or if the command does not require confirmation, the TCB 10
6 enforces the system's security policy at process 145. At this process the
7 TCB 10 determines if the user has the necessary access privileges to
8 perform the requested activity. If the user has the required access
9 rights, the SSVR 12, along with other code in the TCB 10 attempts to
10 execute the command in a conventional manner.
11

12 Upon attempted execution of the command, the SSVR 12 may
13 inform the CC 14 of the execution status. In some high-security
14 situations, concern for information flow from trusted to untrusted code
15 will prevent informing the CC 14. The CC 14 may change the
16 command status to indicate the SSVR 12 response. In addition, in
17 alternate embodiments, the CC 14 changes the command state from
18 command in progress 420 (FIG. 7) to command done 430. In these
19 cases, the CC 14 notifies the submitting untrusted subject by traditional
20 methods (e.g., by advancing an eventcount for that process). The SSVR
21 12 then reestablishes the terminal connection with the computing session
22 in the UOS 20 from which the command was executed.
23

1 In embodiments utilizing the status code, if the user responds with --
2 "no", the secure server informs the session in the UOS 20 that the
3 command was not executed (negative status code). If command states
4 are also employed, the SSVR 12 changes the command state to
5 command done, and re-establishes the user's session in the general UOS
6 20 at process 160.

7
8 If the trusted command requested by the user is a command
9 which affects one of the system databases, and the database record was
10 changed by some other process or user between the time the
11 confirmation display appeared and the current user confirmed the
12 command, then the SSVR 12 displays a message indicating that a change
13 has been made and requests reconfirmation. In this case, the SSVR 12
14 waits for a response as if it were the first time the information was
15 displayed.

16
17 To ensure that if two users attempt to modify the same element
18 at the same time, only one request is rejected, the TCB may utilize
19 identifiers known as "modification counts" (mod-counts).

20
21 Each element of key databases (or registries) may contain a
22 modification count. This mod-count is advanced after each modification
23 and thus identifies how many modifications have been made to the
24 database element. Thus, when a user attempts to modify a database

1 element, the SSVR 12 first obtains that database element's mod-count. --
2 After the user has confirmed the request, the TCB 10 checks the mod-
3 count in the request against the current mod-count.
4

5 A different mod-count indicates that a change has been made to
6 the database element, and the user is asked to reconfirm the request
7 since the result previously confirmed by the user is not what the result
8 would actually be.
9

10 To deter malicious users or subjects from preventing the execution
11 of trusted commands, two measures may be taken. First, certain access
12 rights may be required to change certain database elements. Second,
13 the mod-count should not be advanced when a modification is requested
14 that does not change the database element. In this manner, attempts by
15 malicious subjects to prevent execution of a trusted command, by rapidly
16 and spuriously causing the mod-count to be incremented, will be
17 inhibited.
18

19 Once activity in the SSVR 12 is completed, the user's session in
20 the general UOS 20 is reestablished. In one embodiment, this may be
21 accompanied by the CC 14 informing the untrusted subject of the status
22 of the submitted command. The untrusted code in the general UOS 20
23 then wakes-up the untrusted process running in the UOS 20 at process
24 160. In one embodiment, before the TCB 10 passes the user to the

1 untrusted subject, the SSVR 12 prompts the user to activate a carriage
2 return. This step is necessary to inform the user that he/she is being
3 placed into an untrusted environment.

4 5 4.10 The SSVR as an Audit Recorder

6
7 In one embodiment, the SSVR 12 audits (i.e., creates an audit
8 trail by writing to an audit or log file) at the command level. For direct
9 commands the SSVR 12 audits both the command line and the final
10 status of the command. For trusted commands (secure-attention
11 commands), the SSVR 12 audits both the confirmation display and the
12 final status of the command.

13
14 To record the confirmation displays, the SSVR 12 defines a
15 portion of memory to store the strings of information sent by the SSVR
16 12 to the user's terminal. In one embodiment, this portion of memory is
17 known as the "sink." Only the strings that comprise the SSVR's
18 confirmation screens are placed in the sink.

19
20 Strings may be appended to the sink only when the sink is
21 opened. The sink is opened when the SSVR 12 begins to service a
22 trusted command. The sink may be closed after the user has responded
23 to the confirmation prompt, or before the display of certain requested

1 information. The information stored in the sink does not include the
2 user input to any prompts.
3

4 The information stored in the sink is maintained for auditing
5 purposes and may be utilized according to traditional auditing practices.
6

7 4.11 Confirmation by Others than the Submitting User 8

9 In some situations it may be desirable for users other than the
10 submitting user to confirm a secure-attention command. Such a situation
11 may arise if there is a certain application or command file that includes
12 a privileged command but is needed to be run by a large number of
3 users. In the cases where it may be impracticable to grant all of the
14 users the necessary access rights, it may be possible to grant one user
15 the necessary rights, and to allow him/her to confirm this command for
16 the other users.
17

18 Such non-submitting user confirmation may be accomplished by
19 having the code in the untrusted subject lie about which user is
20 submitting the command. For example, the code in the UOS 20 may
21 ensure that certain commands are always sent to the TCB 10 as if they
22 had been submitted by a selected user.
23

1 One purpose of this select user would be to confirm these certain
2 commands for the other users. After a non-select user submits one of
3 the certain commands, the selected user will be notified that there is a
4 submitted command waiting. The select user may then observe the
5 confirmation display. If the select user determines that the command
6 submitted was a legitimate command, he/she may confirm the command.
7 Otherwise, the original users attempt to execute the command fails.

8 9 4.12 Implementation Approaches

10
11 The method for executing trusted commands described above may
12 be implemented through the use of appropriate software. The actual
13 design and coding is a matter of routine for those skilled in the art
14 having the benefit of this disclosure. Such a design will of course vary
15 with the hardware platform and other factors associated with the specific
16 desired implementation.

17
18 FIG.5 illustrates one such method for implementing the present
19 invention. A programmable machine comprises a central processing unit
20 (CPU) 210, and an input/output (I/O) device 220. The I/O unit 220 is
21 capable of reading and transmitting stored programming instructions
22 from known storage media 230. The CPU 210 is capable of processing
23 these instructions and executing the programming steps represented on

1 media 230. Such systems are well known in the art and will not further
2 be described.

3
4 To implement the invention, the necessary programming steps are
5 stored on storage media 230 by traditional methods. The storage media
6 230 is then read by the I/O unit 220 and the programming instructions
7 are transmitted to the CPU 210. The CPU 210 reads and interprets the
8 instructions, and may thereafter carry out the method of the invention.

1 CLAIMS

2
3 WHAT IS CLAIMED IS:
4

5 1. A machine-executable method for executing a trusted command
6 issued by a user, said method comprising the steps of:

7
8 (a) parsing the trusted command in an untrusted computing
9 environment to generate a parsed command;

10
11 (b) submitting the parsed command to a trusted computing
12 environment; and

13
14 (c) executing the parsed command in the trusted computing
15 environment.
16

17
18
19 2. A method including the steps of claim 1 and additionally including
20 the steps, executed after step (b) of claim 1, of:

21
22 (1) in the trusted environment, displaying a representation of
23 the parsed command to the user;
24

- 1 (2) receiving a signal from the user signifying whether the
2 displayed representation accurately represents the user's
3 intentions;
4
5 (3) if the signal signifies that the displayed representation does
6 not accurately represent the user's intentions, then
7 preventing the performance of step (c) of claim 1.
8
9

10
11 3. The method of claim 2 wherein the representation of the parsed
12 command is displayed, and the signal from the user is received,
13 through a trusted path.
14

15
16
17 4. The method of claim 1 wherein the trusted computing
18 environment comprises a security kernel.
19

20
21
22 5. The method of claim 1 wherein the untrusted computing
23 environment comprises a general operating system.
24

- 1
- 2
- 3 6. A method for executing in a computing system a trusted command
- 4 issued by a user, said method comprising the steps of:
- 5
- 6 (a) receiving user identification data from the user via a
- 7 trusted path;
- 8
- 9 (b) receiving the trusted command from the user via an
- 10 untrusted path;
- 11
- 12 (c) parsing the trusted command in an untrusted computing
- 13 environment to generate a parsed command;
- 14
- 15 (d) submitting the parsed command to a trusted computing
- 16 environment;
- 17
- 18 (e) in the trusted computing environment, performing a security
- 19 check on the parsed command and user identification data;
- 20 and
- 21
- 22 (f) in the trusted computing environment, executing the trusted
- 23 command.
- 24

1
2
3 7. The method of claim 6, wherein the security check enforces an
4 Orange Book security criterion.
5

6
7
8 8. A method including the steps of claim 6 and additionally including
9 the steps, executed after step (d) and before step (f) of claim 6,
10 of:

11
12 (1) in the trusted environment, displaying a
13 representation of the parsed command to the user;
14

15 (2) receiving a signal from the user signifying whether
16 the displayed representation accurately represents the
17 trusted command; and
18

19 (3) if the signal signifies that the displayed
20 representation does not accurately represent the
21 trusted command, then preventing the performance
22 of step (f) of claim 6.
23
24

1
2 9. A method including the steps of claim 6 and additionally including
3 the steps, executed after step (d) and before step (f) of claim 6,
4 of:

5
6 (1) in the trusted environment, displaying a
7 representation of the parsed command to a second
8 user;

9
10 (2) receiving a signal from the second user signifying
11 whether the displayed representation accurately
12 represents a legitimate command; and

13
14 (3) if the signal signifies that the displayed
15 representation does not accurately represent a
16 legitimate command, then preventing the
17 performance of step (f) of claim 6.
18
19
20

21 10. A method for ensuring the existence of a trusted path in a
22 computing system comprising the steps of:
23

- 1 (a) in a trusted computing environment, upon login by a user, --
2 assigning a process identifier to the user in the trusted
3 computing environment;
4
5 (b) storing the assigned process identifier in trusted memory;
6
7 (c) establishing a trusted path;
8
9 (d) in the trusted path, displaying the process identifier to the
10 user; and
11
12 (e) upon a subsequent entry into the trusted path, displaying
13 the process identifier to the user.

14
15
16
17 11. The method of claim 10 wherein the process identifier is a
18 randomly or pseudo-randomly generated group of alphanumeric
19 characters.

20
21
22
23 12. The method of claim 11 wherein the process identifier is
24 pronounceable.

1
2
3
4 13. An automatic data processing machine programmed to execute the
5 method of any one of claims 1 to 12.
6
7

8
9 14. An automatic data processing machine comprising means for
10 performing the method steps of any one of claims 1 to 12.
11
12

13
14 15. A program storage device readable by a machine and tangibly
15 embodying a representation of a program of instructions adaptable
16 to be executed by said machine to perform the method of any
17 one of claims 1 to 12.
18
19
20

1 16. Apparatus for executing a trusted command that is issued by a
2 user and that is parsed by untrusted parsing means to generate a
3 parsed command, comprising:

4
5 (a) trusted means for receiving the parsed command; and

6
7 (b) trusted means for executing the parsed command.
8
9

10
11 17. Apparatus for controlling the execution by a machine of a trusted
12 command that is issued by a user and that is parsed by untrusted
13 parsing means to generate a parsed command, comprising:

14
15 (a) trusted-program storage means, readable by the machine,
16 for causing the machine to receive the parsed command
17 from the untrusted parsing means; and

18
19 (b) trusted-program storage means, readable by the machine,
20 for causing the machine to execute the parsed command.
21
22
23

1 18. Apparatus for controlling the execution by a machine of a trusted
2 command that is issued by a user with user identification data and
3 that is parsed by untrusted parsing means to generate a parsed
4 command, comprising:

- 5
- 6 (a) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
7 for causing the machine to receive the user identification
8 data from the user;
- 9
- 10 (b) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
11 for causing the machine to receive the parsed command
12 from the untrusted parsing means;
- 13
- 14 (c) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
15 for causing the machine to perform a security check on the
16 parsed command and a security check on the user
17 identification data; and
- 18
- 19 (d) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
20 for causing the machine to execute the trusted command.
21
22
23

1 19. Apparatus as in claim 18 and additionally comprising:

2
3 (1) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
4 for causing the machine to display a representation of the
5 parsed command to the user;

6
7 (2) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
8 for causing the machine to receive a signal from the user
9 signifying whether the displayed representation accurately
10 represents the trusted command; and

11
12 (3) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
13 for preventing the machine from executing the trusted
14 command if the signal signifies that the parsed command
15 does not accurately represent the trusted command.

16
17 20. Apparatus as in claim 18 and additionally comprising:

18
19 (1) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
20 for causing the machine to display a representation of the
21 parsed command to a second user;

22
23 (2) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
24 for causing the machine to receive a signal from the second

1 user signifying whether the displayed representation
2 accurately represents a legitimate command; and

- 3
4 (3) trusted program storage means, readable by the machine,
5 for preventing the machine from executing the trusted
6 command if the signal signifies that the parsed command
7 does not accurately represent a legitimate command.

ABSTRACT

A method for executing trusted commands, in which a trusted command is first received from a user at a user terminal and parsed by untrusted code; then passed to a trusted computing base for execution. The trusted computing base displays some indication of what is to be done back to the user for confirmation. Confirmation of the commands prevents unauthorized modification of the commands and increases system confidence. A randomly (or pseudo-randomly) generated process identifier is employed to verify the existence of a trusted path.

g:\digu\012\08.toe




Figure 1




Figure 3

10

11

12

14

16

SSVR (Secure Server)

CC (Command Conveyer)

VT (VTerm)

Figure 2




Figure 4A




Figure 4B




Figure 5





Figure 6



Notation:

Unusual Path

—————

Normal Path

FIGURE 7

DECLARATION

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

I am a United States citizen. My residence address is set forth below beneath my name.

The below named inventors are the original, first and joint inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled **METHOD FOR EXECUTING TRUSTED PATH COMMANDS**, the specification of which was filed as **Serial No. 479,666**, on February 13, 1990. I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims as amended by a Preliminary Amendment filed herewith. I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56(a).

I hereby direct that all correspondence and telephone calls be addressed to D. C. Toedt, Esq., Regis. No. 31,144, Arnold, White & Durkee, P.O. Box 4433, Houston, Texas 77210, (713) 787-1400.

I hereby declare that all statements made of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Mary Ellen Zurko May 16/1990
 Mary Ellen Zurko (date)
 230 Nashua Road, Groton MA 04250

Andrew Halstead Mason 17 May 90
 Andrew Halstead Mason (date)
 61 Baxter Road, Hollis NH 03049

Thomas Andrew Casey, Jr. (date)
 194 School Street, Westwood MA 02090

Paul Douglas Sawyer 17 May 1990
 Paul Douglas Sawyer (date)
 16 Governor Peabody Rd, Billerica MA 01821

Morrie Gasser 5/18/90
 Morrie Gasser (date)
 11 Golden Hills Road, Saugus MA 01906

Leslie Richard Kendall 5/16/90
 Leslie Richard Kendall (date)
 5 Goodwin Road, Gloucester MA 01930

Judith Shelhorse Hall 5/16/90
 Judith Shelhorse Hall (date)
 47 Indian Ridge Road, Sudbury MA 01776

Steven B. Lipner 16 May 90
 Steven B. Lipner
 6 Midland Road, Wellesley MA 02181

Clifford Earl Kahn 16 May 1990
 Clifford Earl Kahn (date)
 15 Weld St., Unit 26, Framingham MA 01701

DECLARATION

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

I am a United States citizen. My residence address is set forth below beneath my name.

The below named inventors are the original, first and joint inventors of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled **METHOD FOR EXECUTING TRUSTED PATH COMMANDS**, the specification of which was filed as **Serial No. 479,666**, on February 13, 1990. I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims as amended by a Preliminary Amendment filed herewith. I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56(a).

I hereby direct that all correspondence and telephone calls be addressed to D. C. Toedt, Esq., Regis. No. 31,144, Arnold, White & Durkee, P.O. Box 4433, Houston, Texas 77210, (713) 787-1400.

I hereby declare that all statements made of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Mary Ellen Zurko (date)
230 Nashua Road, Groton MA 04250

Andrew Halstead Mason (date)
61 Baxter Road, Hollis NH 03049

Thomas Andrew Casey 5-17-90
Thomas Andrew Casey, Jr. (date)
194 School Street, Westwood MA 02090

Paul Douglas Sawyer (date)
16 Governor Peabody Rd, Billerica MA 01821

Morrie Gasser (date)
11 Golden Hills Road, Saugus MA 01906

Leslie Richard Kendall (date)
5 Goodwin Road, Gloucester MA 01930

Judith Shelhorse Hall (date)
47 Indian Ridge Road, Sudbury MA 01776

Steven B. Lipner
6 Midland Road, Wellesley MA 02181

Clifford Earl Kahn (date)
15 Weld St., Unit 26, Framingham MA 01701